

[10th December 1923]

LAW AND JUSTICE.

Report of the Committee to make suggestions regarding the separation of executive and judicial functions.

8 Q.—MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the report of the Committee appointed to make suggestions regarding the separation of executive and judicial functions has been received and whether there is any intention on the part of the Government to publish the same for public criticism ;

(b) whether it is a fact that if the main recommendations of the Committee are accepted, they will lead to a redistribution of the jurisdiction of all the present revenue and criminal officers ?

A.—(a) The report of the Committee has been received and will be placed before the Council as soon as possible together with a statement of the Government's views thereon.

(b) The recommendations of the Committee would necessitate an alteration in the jurisdiction of practically every Revenue Divisional Officer and Subdivisional Magistrate. A certain amount of alteration in the jurisdiction of subordinate magistrates would also be required.

MR. S. SATYAMURTI:—“ May I ask the hon. Law Member] whether instead of the vague phrase ‘ as soon as possible ’ he can give us an approximate idea of the time when he hopes to place a statement of the Government's views thereon on the table ?

The hon. MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“ I have just revised the draft order and it is probably in the press now.”

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Levy of railway cess by district boards.

9 Q.—MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the district boards that were levying a railway cess until the new Local Boards Act of 1920 was passed and put into force ;

(b) the district boards that ceased to levy the railway cess after the new Act came into force, the reasons for the discontinuance of the cess, the total sum accumulated till then to the credit of each of these boards and the arrangements, if any, made for its disposal ; and

(c) the district boards that are at present levying the railway cess and the amount that remains under that head to the credit of each of them ?

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| A.—(a) (1) Arcot, | (6) Guntur. | (12) Salem. |
| South. | (7) Kistna. | (13) South Kanara. |
| (2) Coimbatore. | (8) Kurnool. | (14) Tinnevely. |
| (3) Cuddapah. | (9) Madura. | (15) Trichinopoly. |
| (4) Ganjam. | (10) Nellore. | (16) Vizagapatam. |
| (5) Godavari. | (11) Ramnad. | |

10th December 1923]

(b) & (c) The Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, does not permit the levy of railway cess. District boards therefore ceased to levy the cess when the new Act came into force. The amount of railway cess accumulated up to 31st March 1923 was as shown below :—

| Name of the district board. | Amount invested up to 31st March 1923. | Cash balance on 31st March 1923. |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | RS. | RS. |
| 1. Arcot, South ... | 13,99,600 | 35,810 |
| 2. Coimbatore ... | 9,06,875 | 1,52,462 |
| 3. Cuddapah ... | 2,12,353 | 11,136 |
| 4. Ganjam ... | 2,26,400 | 81,729 |
| 5. Godavari ... | 3,75,200 | 6,782 |
| 6. Guntur ... | 5,69,303 | 1,33,787 |
| 7. Kanara, South ... | 3,24,100 | 12,322 |
| 8. Kistna ... | 23,04,500 | 7,33,626 |
| 9. Kurnool ... | 7,16,800 | 1,25,152 |
| 10. Madura ... | 8,04,000 | 2,36,945 |
| 11. Nellore ... | 6,79,419 | ... |
| 12. Ramnad ... | 7,56,300 | 2,03,915 |
| 13. Salem ... | 7,14,500 | 1,60,671 |
| 14. Tinnevely ... | ... | 1,01,593 |
| 15. Trichinopoly ... | 5,38,700 | 91,344 |
| 16. Vizagapatam ... | 4,76,700 | 33,284 |
| Total ... | 1,10,04,750 | 21,20,558 |

Most of the amounts shown as cash balance have since been invested. The report of a committee appointed to consider the question of utilizing these accumulations for the construction of light railways in the Presidency is under the consideration of Government.

Distance-limit between toll-gates in Coimbatore.

10 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any provision for a minimum distance-limit between toll-gates under the rules of the Government; and

(b) whether the Government have received any memorials objecting to the creation of several new gates in the Coimbatore district which are within about 15 miles distance from existing toll-gates; and whether the Government have taken any action on them?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative. Toll-gates on the same road should ordinarily be 20 miles distant from each other. Local fund toll-gates should ordinarily be at least 10 miles distant from municipal toll-gates.

(b) The Government have not recently received any such memorial.